

Application No.: 10/083,092

Case No.: 56471US010

**Remarks**

Claims 1 and 5 – 30 are pending. Claim 1 has been currently amended. Claims 19 - 23 and 25 - 28 have been withdrawn from consideration.

**Specification**

Applicants have amended the first paragraph of the specification to reflect the status of the parent application as abandoned. Applicants have also corrected a typographical error in the paragraph on page 15, beginning on line 9. The word “ant-corrosion” was corrected to the word “anti-corrosion.”

**§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 24, and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/64235 (Hoyle et al.) The Patent Office submits in part that: Hoyle et al. disclose a protective article having a backing containing a fluoropolymer that is not perfluorinated and a curable adhesive layer on at least one surface.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection because Hoyle et al. do not disclose a protective article having a backing containing a fluoropolymer that is not perfluorinated and a curable adhesive layer on at least one surface wherein the curable adhesive is a heat, moisture, or UV light curable thermoset adhesive layer on at least one unetched surface, wherein the curable thermoset adhesive layer is an adhesive selected from the group consisting of epoxy resins, acrylates, cyano-acrylates, and urethanes. The adhesives disclosed by Hoyle et al. are pressure sensitive adhesives which are applied to an etched surface of a backing. Examples 8, 10, and 14-22 of Hoyle et al. ultimately refer to Example 7, wherein both sides of the backing were etched. The Example 8 article of Hoyle et al. was made according to Example 7 of Hoyle et al. except for the following modifications “[t]he web speed was 1.8 meters/minute, Zone 1 was set at 224C, Zone 2 was set at 243C, Zone 3 was set at 246C, and the die temperature was set at 243C”. Since these were the only changes, this means that both sides of the backing were etched. In fact, one of the advantages of the articles of the current invention is that the backing layer is not required to be etched in order to get adhesion of the curable adhesive to the fluoropolymer and

Application No.: 10/083,092

Case No.: 56471US010

robust bonds of the article to the substrate to which the article is applied. For at least these reasons, Hoyle et al. do not anticipate the invention as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 24, and 30 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 13, 24, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,470,622 issued to Rinde et al. The Patent Office submits in part that: Rinde et al. disclose a protective article having a backing containing a fluoropolymer that is not perfluorinated and a thermoset adhesive as claimed on at least one unetched surface of the backing.

Rinde et al. disclose an article having a fluoropolymer backing and an adhesive on the backing. The Rinde et al. adhesive is a mixture of a thermosetting resin and an amorphous thermoplastic resin. Applicants have amended claim 1 so to limit Applicants' adhesives to those thermosetting resins listed in the Markush group. Applicants deleted the term "comprising" in the adhesive element recitation and replaced it with "is" and thus limiting the adhesive component to only the listed thermosetting resins. For at least this reason, Rinde et al. do not anticipate the invention as now claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinde et al. (U.S. 5,470,622) in view of Neumann et al. (U.S. 5,889,125). Neumann et al. was cited as disclosing polymer diamine curing agent.

Rinde et al. has been discussed above. Neumann et al. do not disclose information to supplement the defects of Rinde et al. in any substantive manner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinde et al. (U.S. 5,470,622).

Application No.: 10/083,092

Case No.: 56471US010

Rinde et al. has been discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 1. Because Rinde et al. do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, Rinde et al. cannot render any claim dependent upon claim 1 obvious. For at least this reason, Rinde et al. do not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

13 December, 2004  
DateBy: 

Scott A. Bardell, Reg. No.: 39,594

Telephone No.: (651) 736-6935

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833